

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims pending in the instant application are numbered 1-10 and 15-18. Claims 1-10 and 15-18 presently stand rejected. Claims 16 and 17 have been canceled without prejudice and claims 1-6, 15 and 18 have been amended herewith. The Applicants respectfully request that the amendment be entered and that instant application be reconsidered in view of the following remarks.

35 USC § 112 Rejections

In the March 23, 2006 Office Action, claims 1-10 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the March 23, 2006 Office Action remarks that arrangements in claims 1 and 6 should be clarified. Accordingly, claims 1 and 6 have been amended to further clarify the arrangements and more particularly point and distinctly claim the recited subject matter. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the instant section 112 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 Rejections

In the March 23, 2006 Office Action, claims 1-10 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dangler et al, US Pat. No. 5,760,669 (hereinafter Dangler). In addition, the March 23, 2006 Office Action also rejects claims 5, 7-9 and 17-18 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dangler. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dangler in view of Chen, US Patent No. 5,124,681 (hereinafter Chen).

With regard to a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, MPEP § 2131.01 sets forth that

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)

With regard to a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, MPEP § 2143.03 sets forth that

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, than any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Independent claim 1 as presently amended expressly recites

1. An energy transfer element, comprising:
 - a single magnetic element including an external surface;
 - first and second electrically conductive pins attached to the single magnetic element;
 - a first winding wound around the single magnetic element directly around the external surface of the single magnetic element without a bobbin, the first winding having first and second ends coupled to the first and second conductive pins, respectively, the first winding magnetically coupled to the single magnetic element; and
 - a second winding wound around the single magnetic element directly over the first winding, the second winding having first and second ends not coupled to electrically conductive pins attached to the single magnetic element, second winding magnetically coupled to the magnetic such that energy to be received from a power converter circuit input is to be transferred from the first winding to the second winding through the magnetic coupling provided by the single magnetic element to a power converter circuit output.

Therefore, claim 1 as presently amended expressly recites that a first winding wound is around the single magnetic element directly around an external surface of the single magnetic element without a bobbin. The first winding has first and second ends that are coupled to the first and second conductive pins, respectively. A second winding is wound

around the single magnetic element directly over the first winding. The second winding has first and second ends that are not coupled to electrically conductive pins attached to the single magnetic element.

Dangler is directed to low profile inductor/transformer component. Dangler fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention as presently claimed. For example, Dangler fails to disclose, teach or fairly suggest a first winding would around a single magnetic element directly around the external surface of the magnetic element without a bobbin. Instead, Dangler discloses in column 3, lines 7-8, that “[d]isposed between the *lower core-half* 18 and the *upper core half* 20 is a *pre-wound coil* 22.” Therefore, Dangler teaches *pre-wound* coil 22 that is disposed between a core having at least *two halves*. Furthermore, Dangler fails to disclose, teach or fairly suggest a second winding that is wound around the single magnetic element directly over the first winding with the second winding having first and second ends that are not coupled to electrically conductive pins attached to the single magnetic element, as expressly recited in the presently claimed invention.

The remaining claims 2-10, 15 and 18 are dependent claims and therefore distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Indeed, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-10, 15 and 18 are patentable by virtue of their dependent from independent claim 1, which the Applicants respectfully submit is patentable for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the instant section 102 and 103 rejections be withdrawn.

If there is a deficiency in fees, please charge our Deposit Acct. No. 02-2666.

The Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:

6-23-06

James W. Go
Reg. No. 40,621

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(206) 292-8600

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on June 23, 2006

Date of Deposit

Luci M. Arevalo

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Luci M. Arevalo

Signature

June 23, 2006

Date